

The Writers' Workshop Impact to the Writing of English Foreign Language (EFL) Learner in Indonesia

Masrul

Email: masrulum25@gmail.com

¹Universitas Pahlawan Tuanku Tambusai

Ummi Rasyidah

Email: ummirasyidah@yahoo.com

Universitas Pasir Pengaraian

Received: October 2023

Accepted:

November 2023

Published:

December 2023

Abstract

The research delved into assessing the impact of the Writers' Workshop approach on the English writing proficiency of students exhibiting diverse writing abilities. The Writers' Workshop is an instructional method that prioritizes cultivating students' writing skills through a sequence of imaginative and reflective activities. Within this approach, students are empowered to become active writers, granted the freedom to explore their ideas, craft their own manuscripts, and engage in collaborative efforts with their peers. In Riau, Indonesia, thirty-five students (19 females and 16 males) participated in English writing instruction grounded in the Writers' Workshop framework. This intervention occurred once a week for a continuous sixteen-week period. As part of the evaluation, students were tasked with composing an opinion essay as both a pre-test and post-test to gauge their writing proficiency. Notably, there was a significant improvement in the writing results across all groups, each displaying distinctive outcomes. The advanced group exhibited more pronounced benefits compared to the intermediate and novice groups, evident in the content of their essays. This disparity underscores the effectiveness of the Writers' Workshop approach, particularly in catering to varying skill levels. The positive strides observed in the students' writing abilities signify the potential of this method to foster holistic development in English writing skills, emphasizing the importance of tailored approaches in heterogeneous learning environments.

Keywords: *Writers' workshop, mini-lesson, peer editing, drafting, revising.*

INTRODUCTION

Writers' workshops are parts of comprehensive literacy program, where teachers are required to schedule one hour of daily writing instruction and practice. The Writers Workshop method was created by ([Smagorinsky et al., 2010](#)). [Graves \(1983\)](#) based on a process-oriented approach that assists students with restricted English language abilities. [Calkins \(1994\)](#) stated that this model is student-centered where students are allowed to explore their writing ability and write about more meaningful personal topics. This approach focuses on the writing method, writing frequency, student decision-making, peer participation, sharing work with teachers and other

students, and direct instruction ([Harris et al., 2006](#)). In this method, the teacher participates in writing (10–15 minutes) prior to individual progress checks (5 minutes), independent writing and conferencing (20–25 minutes), and group sharing (20–25 minutes) (5 minutes) ([Calkins, 2007](#)). This method enables students to organize their own writing ([Fletcher & Portalupi, 2004](#)). Furthermore, this method allows students to experience, learn, and practice the process of topic selection, writing / revising, editing, and publishing papers at their own pace ([Calkins, 1994](#); [Harris et al., 2006](#)). As a result, students write the way 'real writers' do ([Calkins, 1994](#)).

A process-oriented approach involves students in writing and other activities similar as done by skilled writers. This approach essentially provides students the opportunity to participate in community discourse throughout the process - before, during, and after assignment fulfillment – thereby students develop larger formative base that enhances their writing. This discourse assists them in developing ideas, asking questions and categorizing concepts ([Owocki & Goodman, 1997](#)) in their writing. However, it was necessary to conduct scientific studies to assess the contribution of this instructional approach's to language learning and writing.

The differences among 'process-oriented,' 'product-oriented,' and 'genre' approaches to writing pedagogy must be acknowledged when considering the idea of the process-oriented method as part of the author's workshop paradigm. The product-oriented writing approach emphasizes linguistic awareness, especially grammar and syntactic structures where instructors need to adapt to the written material. ([Badger & White, 2000](#); [Johnson Rogers, 2010](#)). The method-oriented approach to writing, on the other hand, shifts the focus away from linguistic knowledge and toward linguistic capabilities, such as how to plan, compose, and revise writing, while emphasizing the subject matter, feelings, and context negotiations that occur throughout the writing process. ([Badger & White, 2000](#)). The writer's workshop approach, reflective journals, diaries, or learning notes are the examples of writing processes ([Smithson, 2008](#)).

Currently, genre-oriented analysis is threatening the process-oriented research ([McComiskey, 2000](#); [Atkinson, 2003](#); [Smagorinsky et al., 2010](#)). Experts state that writing is not always related to learning a skill, but it also shapes the social ability because it allows people to communicate in meaningful ways. Some researchers found this genre-oriented approach useful for teaching writing in different genres in international / second languages (L2) ([Y. Huang & Zhang, 2019](#)). However, this genre-oriented approach is considered limited and inappropriate as it mainly focuses on improving writing skills rather than communication. Therefore, writing process is considered a social activity ([Huang & Zhang, 2019](#); [Clark, 2019](#); [Hyland, 2007](#); [Paltridge, 2011](#)) and if a prescriptive approach restricts authors, it limits their self-expression and creativity. ([Johnson Rogers, 2010](#)). Furthermore, some researchers (e.g. [Dyer, 1996](#); [Tangpermpoon, 2008](#)) contend that rather than mutually limiting views, all of these approaches have compatible viewpoints.

The writer's workshop originated as a process-oriented aspect of language learners which focused on the process and products in writing. [Ray \(2001\)](#) explained that a writer's workshop must be highly structured and must follow the same pattern. Thereby, the use of the recursive method consisting of prewriting, drafting, revision, and editing includes an interconnected product-process step that allows students to learn the relationship more comprehensively.

The concept of the framework includes text written for an audience that involves but is not limited to students, all topics covering writing content, knowing processes, and learning grammar, and a systematic approach to the writing process ([Christopher et al., 2000](#); [Smithson, 2008](#) cited

from [Al-Hroub et al., 2019](#)). In this holistic approach, students are able to produce complete and rich informative texts. Using a writer's workshop approach, this study mainly concentrated on both the writing process and the resulting text and highlights the awareness of the current teacher and students. In some ways, the principles and application of the writer's workshop method mimic task-based language teaching (TBLT) in second language teaching. There is a common focus on performing genuine community tasks and maintaining the same core presence.

The Writers' Workshop approach has proven to be an effective method in developing students' writing skills. In several recent studies, as reported by [\(Graham & Harris, 1989\)](#), it was found that students engaged in the Writers' Workshop showed significant improvements in specific aspects, including idea development, essay structure, and revision skills. Furthermore, [\(Schrodt et al., 2019\)](#) highlighted the importance of this approach in building students' motivation for writing. They found that when students have greater control over their work, they tend to be more enthusiastic and confident in expressing their thoughts in writing.

However, amidst this success, EFL learners in Indonesia face specific challenges in honing their writing skills. Some obstacles faced by Indonesian students may involve cultural differences, a lack of resources, or limited access to literature in the English language. By understanding this context, more targeted and relevant learning strategies can be designed to address these specific challenges.

1.1 The Effect on Writing Success

Previous studies have found the positive effect of the writer's workshop approach on students. In a research, [\(Glover, 2010\)](#) showed that group-based workshop writing was more collaborative than usual. In a qualitative research, [\(Schrodt et al., 2019\)](#) demonstrated that such writers' workshops can increase writers' motivation and independence if they incorporate self-organization mindset and strategy instruction into the writers' workshop framework.. However, this findings indicate that writing ability of these students increase in the development of conventional writing and text development [\(Hachem et al., 2008\)](#). Moreover, [\(Graham & Harris, 1989\)](#) combined a writer's workshop approach with skill training and reductionist approach, where they found that students had better writing skills, especially in the areas of long story development, strategy use, and self-efficacy. Research on college students discusses feedback on writing performance between students with the same abilities and students with different abilities. The quality of feedback and student writing performance are not directly related. [Huisman \(2017\)](#) examined the effect of feedback on student performance between high-achieving students and comparison groups. The high achievement group was found superior and ICCF increased their motivation [\(Mujtaba et al., 2020\)](#). Furthermore, this study discusses students' progress in writing performance and self-efficacy beliefs are using the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ) where those factors were not found influential to students' performance. Instead, they affected self-efficacy beliefs [\(Duijnhouwer et al., 2010\)](#). It can be inferred that the writer' workshop approach influences students' writing ability and writing achievement, while it also affects their self-efficacy values and inspiration.

[Louw \(2008\)](#) who examined the effectiveness of standardized feedback when L2 students revise writing to analyze the influences of reviews on students' writing and based problem solving on student attitudes, learning concentration, and instructor focus. Furthermore, [Xu \(2019\)](#) examined the effectiveness of instructional technology applications on the writing standard of

adolescent English learners using a meta approach. The efficacy of technologies in enhancing writing proficiency and EFL writing consistency was examined, which results showed that technology significantly affected the standard of EFL writing. Students' quality of writing improved after the use of feedback and teaching methods that used technology.

In another context, the quality of students' writing includes the accuracy of the content, vocabulary and language used. Writing accuracy is defined as 'the ability to be error free' ([Wolfe-Quintero, 1998](#)) and was assessed using 'holistic measures, number of errors, number of type-specific errors, and measures that account for error severity' ([Polio & Shea, 2014](#)). In writing, accuracy affects writing quality. Whereas, sentence complexity is an important factor that improves students' writing quality (Tortorelli, 2020).

1.2 The Effectiveness of Writers' Workshop Approaches in Various Countries.

Writers' workshop method improves English language proficiency and writing skills. ([Al-hroub et al., 2017](#)) found workshop method affecting the L2 writing skills of elementary school students aged 10-11 years in Beirut, Lebanon. In a research, [Al-hroub et al., \(2017\)](#) found that this workshop approach improved students' writing skills significantly, regardless of students' low proficiency. Meanwhile, in an action research involving English-speaking primary schools in Hong Kong, [Lo & Hyland \(2007\)](#) discovered that the main benefit of exposure to the writers' workshop approach, which requires students to write about topics related to their personal and socio-cultural context include engagement and student motivation. Although writers who were better at following the writer's workshop curriculum did not achieve substantial language performance, the authors concluded that they were "challenged to reconsider their previous writing strategies" ([Lo & Hyland, 2007](#)). According to [Serna \(2009\)](#), students created stories during a writer's workshop to explore the writing production of English language learners (ELL) in a fourth-grade bilingual classroom in Northern California. [Clippard & Nicaise \(1998\)](#) Investigated the writers' workshop approach on students' writing abilities and self-efficacy in the Midwest. They found that students writers' workshop enabled the students to improve their writing skills in better ways than those taught using non-writers' workshops. However, students who were taught using the writer's workshops did not get high scores on standard academic self-esteem assessments. It implies that they believe more in themselves as stronger writers and enjoy the writing process.

Furthermore, writer's workshop approach in various countries does not only affect students' writing skills and English proficiency, but also by the culture of their country. ([Vollmer, 2000](#)) investigated the effect of sociocultural influences and implicit expectations in teachers' discourses on ESL students' writing interactions in California secondary schools. Teachers who used the writer's workshop approach were able to encourage the students to select their own topics, 'at the same time restrict students' writing by seeing them as the only immigrant identity to establish their topic.' [Vollmer \(2000\)](#) stated that teachers should be mindful of how student writers seek to create modern - and multiple - identities in a second language and how classroom activities and tasks can place a restricting identification on writers. Teachers must recognize that student autobiographies created in the classroom must be selective, limited, and influenced by what is considered suitable for classroom education. Moreover, ([Carson & Nelson, 1996](#)) found different critiques, arguing that criticism of other students' written texts (a part of the writer's workshop approach) clashed with the collectivist cultural orientation of Asian students. Bilingual students

add a multicultural dimension to their writing that should not be forced but will motivate them throughout the workshop's writing process. Students should be able to select their subject equally independent of language or social background. The studies presented in this section are set in the sense of a school in a second language environment where the target language is the host community's language.

The previous research remarked writers' workshop was able to increase students' writing ability across all writing ability group ([Al-Hroub et al., 2019](#)). There were significant differences between pre- and post-test scores. However, the findings of this study cannot be applied to foreign language context because the participants of this research were Bilingual students in Beirut where English was the second language. There is also a need to explore the implications of this strategy in a foreign language. Furthermore, research on the impact of this method on students with different levels of writing proficiency in writing in English as a foreign language needed to be conducted. In this current study, the effect of the writers' workshop approach on students' writing in Indonesia is examined.

1.3 Writing Accuracy and Complexity

Complexity is defined as "the extent to which learners produce elaborated language" (Ellis and Barkhuizen 2005: 139), while syntactic complexity measures the use of more challenging or sophisticated structures. There is evidence that specific measurements of syntactic complexity, such as the raw frequency of target grammatical items, can be more accurate in distinguishing different proficiency levels or gauging the outcome of certain teaching methods (Norris and Pfeiffer 2003). General variables of syntactic complexity are useful because they allow comparisons across studies (Tonkyn 2013). In previous task-based studies, general variables measured syntactic complexity that were typically length-based or subordination-based. The number of words per unit (Bygate 2001 (T-unit); Mehnert 1998 (C-unit); Ortega 1999 (pausally defined unit)) and the number of clauses per chosen unit are two examples of length-based variables (Foster and Skehan 1996; Iwashita et al. 2001; Robinson 2001, 2007; Skehan and Foster 1999). The percentage of subordinate clauses in the total number of clauses (Wigglesworth 1997) and the number of subordinate clauses per T-unit are two subordination-based variables (Crookes 1989; Mehnert 1998). Norris and Ortega (2009) argue in a recent article that a comprehensive review of the variables used to measure syntactic complexity that such traditional general variables may be too crude to capture the multi-dimensional nature of L2 learners' development. To address these shortcomings, they recommend incorporating the following variables into a single study: (a) length-based variables (such as words per chosen unit) as an overall measure of syntactic complexity, (b) subordination-based variables, (c) phrasal complexity variables (i.e. clause length), and (d) coordination-based variables (i.e. amount of coordination), rather than focusing solely on subordination. This article investigates four types of variables mentioned above in relation to spoken data, as well as Norris and Ortega's suggestions that (d) may be most indicative of the beginner level, (b) intermediate proficiency, and (c) advanced proficiency.

Accuracy is defined as "the degree to which the target language is produced in accordance with its rulesystem" (Skehan 1996: 23). The percentage of error-free clauses (Foster and Skehan 1996; Skehan and Foster 1999; Yuan and Ellis 2003), the percentage of error-free units (Robinson 2001, 2007 (C-unit)), the number of errors per unit (Bygate 2001 (T-unit)), and the number of errors per 100 words are examples of general variables for measuring accuracy (Mehnert 1998).

Surprisingly, researchers appear to disagree on which variables are thought to be the most valid. According to Bygate (2001), calculating the number of errors per selected 'unit' may be a more sensitive measure of accuracy because it does not obscure the actual occurrences of errors as counting error-free units does. Mehnert (1998), on the other hand, contends that counting errors per 100 words may be more appropriate for relatively low proficiency speakers because it avoids problematic clause and unit definitions. Identifying which variables are 'more sensitive' or 'suitable' necessitates validation (e.g., Kormos and Dénes 2004) – that is, comparing the results of different variables to human judgements of how accurate the performances in question are. There has been no previous research to validate the variables proposed for measuring accuracy. Hence, it is necessary to conduct this study.

1.4 Research Question

The reason for the present research is twofold in this study. To continue, a study of current literature identified inconsistent results regarding the writers' workshop method's efficacy in enhancing the proficiency of young writers writing in their first language. Furthermore, little research has been conducted into the efficacy of writers' workshops in the sense of a foreign language, especially in Indonesia, where the English language is highly valued and a required course. Second, there is conflicting and inconclusive evidence on the impact of the writers' workshop on various writing proficiency standards. Further research into its usefulness for EFL learners with differing writing abilities is needed. The following questions were proposed in this study.

- 1.4.1 Does the writers' workshop approach increase the English writing accuracy (content, vocabulary, and language use) and complexity of foreign language learner?
- 1.4.2 Do upper-primary students with varied English writing proficiency (defined as 'novice', 'intermediate' and 'advanced') benefit differentially from participation in writers' workshops?

METHOD

2.1 Participants

This study included 35 Indonesian senior high school students as participants. Participant had already learnt the process of writing in the previous class and they had been exposed to individual or group work on pre-drafting, drafting and revision. However, writer's workshop was never introduced to them. They had 90 minutes writing session every week during sixteen weeks and teacher usually determined the writing topic.

2.2 Research Design

The pre-test/post-test configuration was used in this study. Over sixteen week, the students were taught using writer's workshop approach during 90 minutes. At the beginning and end of the study, students were asked to compose a brief opinion-based article. Three groups with different writing proficiency (below average, average and above average) were identified based on achievement test score. The development of writing ability was established by comparing pre-test and post-test scores. Control class could not be formed due to the limited number of students.

In this study, groups with different levels of writing proficiency were identified based on students' achievement test scores. There were three main groups formed: below-average group, average group, and above-average group. The identification of groups was done by referring to

students' achievement test scores, which encompassed assessments of their writing abilities. This way, students with scores below the average were placed in the first group, indicating a potentially lower level of writing skills. Students with average scores were placed in the second group, while students with above-average scores were placed in the third group, indicating a higher level of writing proficiency.

This process helped the researchers understand the variations in students' writing abilities and analyze how the Writers' Workshop approach impacted each group with different levels of writing proficiency. Thus, the identification of these groups played a key role in the analysis of the comparison between pre-test and post-test scores to assess the development of writing abilities for each group separately.

2.3 Pedagogic Intervention

2.3.1 Teacher Training

The English teacher who carried out the writer's workshop was graduated from English study program with more than five years English teaching experience. However the teacher did not have experience in applying writers' workshop. The teacher attended the 60-minute training three times where the teacher collaborate with the researchers in in conducting writing session according to writers' workshop and school writing curriculum. Afterwards, researcher randomly observed the implementation of writers' workshop three times followed by reviewed by observer and teacher. The researcher even worked with the teacher on a regular basis to discuss the execution of the writers' workshop session.

2.3.2 The Implementation of Writers' Workshop

Writer's workshop required the students to write a 400-500 word essay to describe their favorite food, beverage and hobby. Students were guided to help them engaged in different steps of writing process: inventing, drafting, and revising. The procedures of writers' workshop are shown as follows.

1. During the mini-lesson (20 minutes), the teacher reflects on one aspect of teaching based on the skill predetermined in the school curriculum.
2. Teacher introduced the examples of students' essays, on the topic.
3. Teacher explicate clearly both oral and written to assist the students to enhance the quality of their essays.
4. Students work individually or in group for 50 minutes, with or without teacher assistant through several writing steps: 1) rehearsal: discover and develop ideas 2) writing down the ideas 3) revision: emphasize content and spelling 4) editing: edit the writing
5. When students actively involved in independent writing, the teacher walks around the class and assists the students in revising, editing and giving feedback to the peers.
6. Using a "writer's chair" with 2-3 classmates, students share their works. Students revise their works based on the reviews (20 minutes)

2.3.3 Assessing Writing Skill

Students were grouped into levels: beginner, intermediate, advanced, and superior ([Call et al., 1994](#)). However, no students managed to get into the superior group. Therefore, only three groups were determined in this study.

1. Below average (novice) level: students were able to write simple paragraph with familiar words. However, their errors and misspellings were found and they had difficulty in mastering the writing process.
2. Average (intermediate) level: students were able to write comprehensible statement and organized paragraph as needed but they had constraints regarding vocabulary and language structure.
3. Above average (advanced) level: Students were able to compose coherent paragraphs using formal language, sufficient vocabulary and good structure. They had strong command of the language and could provide detailed descriptions.

The pre-test and post-test scores were measured based on six writing components: text, organization, vocabulary, language usage, sentence complexity and mechanics. The evaluation of EFL composition profile was derived from Hadley to rate the pre-test and post-test (Call et al., 1994). This evaluation emphasized on the ability-based assessment: outstanding to very mediocre, good to decent, and medium to very poor. The components were mechanic (0-5 points), word choice (0-25 points), content (0-30 points), lexical (0-20 points), and organization (0-20 points).

1. Mechanics: Having mastery of conventions, with few errors in pronunciation, punctuation, capital letters, and paragraphs
2. Word choice: The complex structure is effective, with little errors in agreement, tense, pronouns, number, word order, articles, and prepositions.
3. Content: perceptive thesis development related to the subject.
4. Lexical: advanced vocabulary, efficient word choice, command of word forms, and sufficient register
5. Organization: fluent expression-clear idea, brief, well-organized, logical sequence, cohesive.

Two independent English teachers were requested to score the pre-test and post-test. Inter-rater consistency was also tested for each variable, with an average score of 88 percent with scores varying from 76 percent to 99 percent. The final score was determined by summarizing the scores of two raters.

To measure sentence complexity, we used mean sentence length (MSL).

2.4 Data analysis

Descriptive data were computed based on the scores of the five factors for the whole category as well as for each of the three proficiency group. The effect of experiment was then investigated using MANOVA test followed with Tukey's test to evaluate the significant differences of pair post-hoc related to writing components. Tukey's test was also conducted to determine which group benefited from them implementation of this approach.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

3.1 Findings

The mean scores of five writing elements and the combined number of students' pre-test and post-test essays are presented in Table 1. The six paired scores were compared using paired-sample t-tests to determine the students' writing abilities in the pre-and post-test. Then, at the p 0.1 standard, substantial variations between the pre-and post-test grades were found, suggesting that the writing workshop was able to boost the post-test score substantially.

Table 1. Paired T-Test

Paired Variables (N=35)	Mean	Mean Difference	Unpaired SD	Paired SD	Paired T-Test (df=34)	P-Value
Pair 1 Pre-mechanic	22.057	-2.286	6.216	6.360	-2.126	0.041*
Post-mechanic	24.343		3.948			
Pair 2 Pre-word choice	14.200	-7.914	4.898	7.763	-6.032	0.000*
Post-word choice	22.114		4.651			
Pair 3 Pre-content	14.114	-8.943	4.529	8.124	-6.513	0.000*
Post-content	23.057		5.133			
Pair 4 Pre-lexical	17.657	-6.686	6.135	8.373	-4.724	0.000*
Post-lexical	24.343		3.819			
Pair 5 Pre-organization	3.771	-11.943	3.144	6.668	-10.596	0.000*
Post-organization	15.714		5.665			

*Significant at level $p < 0.1$

The means, standard deviations, and MANOVA of the post-test scores for the three proficiency classes are shown in Table 2. MANOVA test was carried out to assess the success of the writers' workshop approach in enhancing the writing ability of each of the classes. A statistically important difference between the pre-test and post-test tenses at the $p 0.1$ alpha level was found.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics and MANOVA of Post-Test Scores by Proficiency Group.

Dependent variable	Groups	N	Mean	SD	F	P-value
Post-mechanic	Novice	12	20.583	1.564	18.574	0.000*
	Intermediate	11	25.182	2.994		
	Advanced	12	27.333	3.420		
Post-word choice	Novice	12	19.417	2.109	4.202	0.024*
	Intermediate	11	22.546	5.410		
	Advanced	12	24.417	4.680		
Post-content	Novice	12	20.250	5.154	3.490	0.043*
	Intermediate	11	23.636	4.781		
	Advanced	12	25.333	4.418		
Post-lexical	Novice	12	21.250	1.055	12.995	0.000*
	Intermediate	11	24.455	3.475		
	Advanced	12	27.333	3.576		
Post-organization	Novice	12	12.583	4.889	5.256	0.011*
	Intermediate	11	15.273	5.274		
	Advanced	12	19.250	5.048		

*Significant at level $p < 0.1$

Tukey's test was employed to determine if the writers' workshop therapy had a distinct effect on students of varying proficiency levels. Table 3 shows the results of the post hoc Tukey's test.

This test emphasizes whether there were major proficiency category gaps in post-test scores at the p 0.1 alpha stage. On all criteria, major variations in the mean scores of the novice and experienced groups were found. Whereas, seen from the text, lexical, and word use, the beginner and intermediate groups differed substantially. The intermediate and advanced classes, on the other hand, varied only in terms of lexicon and structure. The mean difference between novice and intermediate was MD=4.59, and the mean difference between novice and advanced was MD=6,75. Tukey's test showed the most important gap in material between the three groups was between the beginner and experienced groups at the p 0.1 mark.

Table 3. Multiple Comparisons of Post-Test Component Scores Using Tukey's Test

Dependent variable	Groups (I)	Groups (J)	Mean difference	P-value
Post mechanic	Novice	Intermediate	-4.599	0.001*
		Advanced	-6.750	0.000*
	Intermediate	Novice	4.599	0.001*
		Advanced	-2.152	0.166
	Advanced	Novice	6.750	0.000*
		Intermediate	2.152	0.166
Post word choice	Novice	Intermediate	-3.129	0.200
		Advanced	-5.000	0.019*
	Intermediate	Novice	3.129	0.200
		Advanced	-1.871	0.551
	Advanced	Novice	5.000	0.019*
		Intermediate	1.871	0.551
Post content	Novice	Intermediate	-3.386	0.224
		Advanced	-5.083	0.037*
	Intermediate	Novice	3.386	0.224
		Advanced	-1.697	0.676
	Advanced	Novice	5.083	0.037*
		Intermediate	1.697	0.676
Post lexical	Novice	Intermediate	-3.205	0.034*
		Advanced	-6.083	0.000*
	Intermediate	Novice	3.205	0.034*
		Advanced	-2.879	0.062*
	Advanced	Novice	6.083	0.000*
		Intermediate	2.879	0.062*
Post organization	Novice	Intermediate	-2.689	0.421
		Advanced	-6.667	0.008*
	Intermediate	Novice	2.689	0.421
		Advanced	-3.977	0.161
Advanced	Novice	6.667	0.008*	

*Significant at level $p < 0.1$

3.2 Discussion

The first research question concerns the influence of the writer's workshop method on students' learning accuracy (content, vocabulary, language use). Many researchers found vocabulary as the most essential predictor of both reading and writing skills ([Kim et al., 2020](#)). Furthermore, there is a connection between correct efficient awareness of high-frequency word families and writing ([Johnson et al., 2016](#)). Regarding writing, the assessment on EFL students' writing revealed that vocabulary had the largest amount of variance with 8.06 % content and 4.04% language use ([Astika, 1993](#)). Therefore, this approach is expected to improve students' writing because this approach has been designed to support students' writing development particularly on writing accuracy component vocabulary, content and language use.

The study showed that the writer's workshop approach affected students' writing and that there was a substantial increase in the overall pre-test and post-test writing accuracy levels particularly on vocabulary, content and language use. These results are consistent with ([Salem & Atta 2013](#)) who stated that the writing workshop curriculum has a substantial influence on improving students' fundamental writing skills as well as the improvement of subjects' practical writing skills ([Salem, 2013](#)). Students who attended the weekly writer's workshop became more optimistic and proficient in using descriptive vocabulary in their prose ([Bayer, 1999](#)). Students' writing skills also increase as shown by their text growth, concept extension, and improvement in traditional writing ([Hachem et al., 2008](#)).

On the other side, several researchers found that students who used the SRSD (Self-Regulated Strategy Development) method produced longer, more accurate, and qualitatively superior papers than their classmates who used writers' workshops ([Graham et al., 2005](#)). Another researcher found no significant differences between students taught using traditional writing approach and writer's workshop ([Pollington et al., 2001](#)). Similarly, ([Suprianti, 2015](#)) stated the group of students taught using Journal Writing technique tend to have better score rather than taught using writer's workshop. Furthermore, writers often have tough time balancing the cognitive and peer requirements of the writing process. ([Helsel & Greenberg, 2007](#)).

The second research concerns on whether or not primary students with different writing proficiency improve after attending writer's. The findings showed that there was a substantial mean difference in the mean scores among groups on all three writing components, with the greater difference being on the content with below level and above good grades. The findings showed that the writer workshop approach has a greater impact to high-achieving writers than on under-achieving writers.

This difference could be related to the fact that experienced students were capable of writing understandable paragraphs with systematic correspondence, appropriate vocabulary, and successful paragraphs with few grammatical errors ([Call et al., 1994b](#)). It indicated the needs of teachers' assistance during writing class on below average students because it will be useful for them rather than upper-level students. Meanwhile students who struggle with writing often have limited performance on planning, ideas generation, the transcription of word into print, revision, and writing knowledge ([Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. 2002](#)). They often encountered difficulties with the simple transcription method of writing, such as handwriting, pronunciation,

capitalization, and punctuation, which affected their ability to make advanced writing level, such as planning and evaluation ([Macarthur, 1999](#)). Furthermore, they also have few revision ideas, lack understanding of assessment requirements, are less able to identify and diagnose issues, and struggle to formulate successful revision strategies ([Macarthur et al., 2004](#)). Most of them were capable of writing only very simple paragraph using familiar words ([Al-Hroub et al., 2019](#)). Therefore, [Lee et al \(2019\)](#) suggested to utilize online collaboration revision to help them.

Thus, the process of revision was smooth for advanced students and they could devote their attention on the content and style. There was no differences in quality of draft among the group did revision and the group did not do revision ([Huang 2015](#)). The possible reason for this situation is the students' experiences as the fundamental for improving writing skill and acquiring essential academic research knowledge ([Bacha, 2002](#)). Furthermore, writing difficulties were caused by a inadequate time allocation and trust, a lack of extended writing level, a lack of reading and comprehension of academic journals, sources, and academic jargon. ([Itua et al., 2014](#)). Students' self-awareness can be a solution, as it allows clearer comprehension of the writing process, additional resources, and confidence in moving through academic tasks ([Fernsten & Reda, 2011](#)).

In writers' workshop, successful mini-lessons and editing sessions help students improve their grammar and organization. Developing a sense of audience by peer analysis can assist students in writing more successful introductions, bodies, and conclusions, as well as the elaboration of key points. It has been disputed that writer's workshop assist the students about what they want to write and becoming motivate to write coherently. Students' awareness about their audience will make them write longer sentences with sophisticated vocabulary and changed their focus from writing for themselves to writing for an audience.

Students' capacity to edit their writing results from the conferring, peer revision, and editing activities. In addition, some aspects improved, including mechanical error, the improvement on spelling and writing correct punctuation. However, the improvement in terms of capitalization and punctuation was not significant. It can be argued that the primary advantage of a writer's workshop is the participation in social contact, teamwork in the workplace, exchanging information, responding to and providing input. On the contrary, students who struggle need more opportunities to learn either from teacher or self-initiative to address their inadequacy in editing knowledge and skill.

CONCLUSION

In brief, this study presents the values and the role of writer workshop in assisting students to develop writing proficiency in second language. After intervention process, all students were able to write more fluently and they found it easier to go through with peer interaction to add details and revise their works. Besides, the statistical result proposes that the advanced students get more advantages in term of content than Intermediate and novices' students. It is possible that advanced students learn from the scaffolding provided during revision and conferring. Furthermore, they benefited from participating in self-selected activities of particular interest. The novice and intermediate classes, on the other hand, need instructor assistance to deliver mini lessons.

It is crucial for future research to conduct a more detailed analysis of the progress of the control group, which was not fully undertaken in this study. By doing so, a more comprehensive and thorough comparison can be made regarding the impact of the Writers' Workshop approach on the development of students' writing abilities. Subsequent studies should explore the effects of

the Writers' Workshop approach in various educational contexts. This will aid in generalizing research findings to understand the extent to which this approach can be applied in diverse learning situations. Detailing the long-term implications of the Writers' Workshop approach can provide deeper insights into whether its benefits endure over time. This study suggests that long-term research can offer a better understanding of how writer's workshops can enhance students' writing abilities over the course of time.

This research provides empirical support for the implementation of the Writers' Workshop approach in the second language context. Teachers can leverage these findings to design more effective writing instruction strategies, particularly to enhance students' expressive writing abilities. The study underscores that beginner and intermediate groups require more instructor assistance in delivering mini-lessons. Therefore, teachers can provide additional support and intensive guidance for these groups in the Writers' Workshop approach. The study's findings emphasize the importance of student motivation and participation in self-selected activities. Teachers can design writing activities that allow students to choose topics of interest to enhance motivation and active participation.

This research faced limitations as it could not form a control class due to the limited number of students. To overcome this, future research can involve a larger number of participants or consider using alternative research methods to measure the effectiveness of the Writers' Workshop approach. While statistical results indicate significant differences among advanced, intermediate, and novice groups, a more in-depth analysis of specific aspects of writing abilities can provide detailed insights and directions for further development.

Considering these implications, this research makes a valuable contribution to understanding the effectiveness of the Writers' Workshop approach in enhancing the writing abilities of EFL students. As a result, teachers and researchers can use these findings as a foundation to design better writing instruction and guide future research in this field.

REFERENCES

- Al-hroub, A., Shami, G., & Evans, M. (2017). The impact of the 'writers' workshop' approach on the L2 English writing of upper-primary students in Lebanon. *The Language Learning Journal*, 0(0), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2016.1249394>
- Al-Hroub, A., Shami, G., & Evans, M. (2019). The impact of the 'writers' workshop' approach on the L2 English writing of upper-primary students in Lebanon. *Language Learning Journal*, 47(2), 159–171. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2016.1249394>
- Astika, G. G. (1993). Analytical Assessments of Foreign Students' Writing. *RELC Journal*, 24(1), 61–70. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003368829302400104>
- Atkinson, D. (2003). Writing and culture in the post-process era. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(1), 49–63. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(02\)00126-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(02)00126-1)
- Bacha, N. N. (2002). Developing learners' academic writing skills in higher education: A study for educational reform. *Language and Education*, 16(3), 161–177. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500780208666826>
- Badger, R., & White, G. (2000). *A process genre approach to teaching writing*. <http://eltj.oxfordjournals.org/>
- Bayer, R. A. (1999). *The Effects of a First Grader's Participation in a Writer's Workshop On Their Ability To Become More Confident and More Descriptive Writers*.

- Calkins, L. (1994). *The Art of Teaching Writing*.
<https://www.heinemann.com/products/08809.aspx>
- Calkins, L. (2007). *UNITS OF STUDY in Opinion, Information, and Narrative Writing Grade 2 Sampler*.
- Call, M. E., Hadley, A. O., & Rieken, E. (1994a). Teaching Language in Context. *The Modern Language Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2307/329265>
- Call, M. E., Hadley, A. O., & Rieken, E. (1994b). Teaching Language in Context Teaching Language in Context Workbook. *The Modern Language Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2307/329265>
- Carson, J. G., & Nelson, G. L. (1996). Chinese Students' Perceptions of ESL Peer Response Group Interaction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 5(1), 1–19. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(96\)90012-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(96)90012-0)
- Christopher, N., Ewald, M., & Giangrosso, S. (2000). *IMPROVING INADEQUATE WRITERS*.
- Clark, I. L. (2019). *Concepts in Composition: Theory and Practices in the Teaching of Writing (3rd Edition)*. <https://www.routledge.com/Concepts-in-Composition-Theory-and-Practices-in-the-Teaching-of-Writing/Clark/p/book/9781138088658>
- Clippard, D., & Nicaise, M. (1998). Efficacy of writers' workshop for students with significant writing deficits. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 13(1), 7–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02568549809594723>
- Duijnhouwer, H., Prins, F. J., & Stokking, K. M. (2010). Progress feedback effects on students' writing mastery goal, self-efficacy beliefs, and performance. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 16(1), 53–74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611003711393>
- Dyer, B. (1996). L1 and L2 composition theories: Hillocks' 'environmental mode' and task-based language teaching. *ELT Journal*, 50(4), 312–317. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/50.4.312>
- ERIC - EJ1077107 - *The Effect of Using Writer's Workshop Approach on Developing Basic Writing Skills (Mechanics of Writing) of Prospective Teachers of English in Egypt, English Language Teaching, 2013*. (n.d.).
- Fernsten, L. A., & Reda, M. (2011). Helping students meet the challenges of academic writing. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 16(2), 171–182. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2010.507306>
- Fletcher, R., & Portalupi, J. (2004). *Teaching the Qualities of Writing by Ralph Fletcher, JoAnn Portalupi*. <https://www.heinemann.com/products/e00629.aspx>
- Glover, S. (2010). Cohort-based supervision of postgraduate creative writers: The effectiveness of the university-based writers' workshop. *New Writing*, 7(2), 123–136. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790726.2010.482670>
- Graham; Steve; Harris; Karen R. (n.d.). *Prevention and Intervention for Struggling Writers*. - *PsycNET*.
- Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (1989). Components Analysis of Cognitive Strategy Instruction: Effects on Learning Disabled Students' Compositions and Self-Efficacy. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 81(3), 353–361. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.81.3.353>
- Graham, S., Harris, K. R., & Mason, L. (2005). Improving the writing performance, knowledge, and self-efficacy of struggling young writers: The effects of self-regulated strategy development. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 30(2), 207–241. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2004.08.001>

- Graves, D. H. (1983). *Writing: Teachers and Children at Work*. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED234430>
- Hachem, A., Nabhani, M., & Bahous, R. (2008). 'We can write!' the writing workshop for young learners. *Education 3-13*, 36(4), 325–337. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004270701651761>
- Harris, K. R., Graham, S., & Mason, L. H. (2006). Improving the Writing, Knowledge, and Motivation of Struggling Young Writers: Effects of Self-Regulated Strategy Development With and Without Peer Support. *American Educational Research Journal*, 43(2), 295–340. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312043002295>
- Helsel, L., & Greenberg, D. (2007). Helping Struggling Writers Succeed: A Self-Regulated Strategy Instruction Program. *The Reading Teacher*, 60(8), 752–760. <https://doi.org/10.1598/rt.60.8.5>
- Huang, S. C. (2015). Setting Writing Revision Goals after Assessment for Learning. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 12(4), 363–385. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2015.1092544>
- Huang, Y., & Zhang, L. J. (2019). Does a Process-Genre Approach Help Improve Students' Argumentative Writing in English as a Foreign Language? Findings From an Intervention Study Does a Process-Genre Approach Help Improve Students' Argumentative Writing in English as a Foreign Language. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 0(0), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2019.1649223>
- Huisman, B., Saab, N., van Driel, J., & van den Broek, P. (2017). Peer feedback on college students' writing: exploring the relation between students' ability match, feedback quality and essay performance. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 36(7), 1433–1447. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2017.1325854>
- Hyland, K. (2007). Genre pedagogy: Language, literacy and L2 writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(3), 148–164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.07.005>
- Itua, I., Coffey, M., Merryweather, D., Norton, L., & Foxcroft, A. (2014). Exploring barriers and solutions to academic writing: Perspectives from students, higher education and further education tutors. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 38(3), 305–326. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2012.726966>
- Johnson, M. D., Acevedo, A., & Mercado, L. (2016). Vocabulary Knowledge and Vocabulary Use in Second Language Writing. *TESOL Journal*, 7(3), 700–715. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.238>
- Johnson Rogers, R. (2010). Incorporating Metacognitive Strategy Training in ESP Writing Instruction: English for Lawyers. *English Language Teaching*, 3(4), p3. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v3n4p3>
- Kim, M., Crossley, S. A., & Kim, B. K. (2020). Second language reading and writing in relation to first language, vocabulary knowledge, and learning backgrounds. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2020.1838434>
- Lee, S. H., Bernstein, M., & Georgieva, Z. (2019). Online collaborative writing revision intervention outcomes for struggling and skilled writers: An initial finding. *Preventing School Failure*, 63(4), 297–307. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1045988X.2018.1504741>
- Lo, J., & Hyland, F. (2007). Enhancing students' engagement and motivation in writing: The case of primary students in Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(4), 219–237. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.06.002>
- Louw, H. (2008). The effectiveness of standardised feedback when L2 students revise writing. *Language Matters*, 39(1), 88–110. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10228190802321053>

- Macarthur, C. A. (1999). Overcoming barriers to writing: Computer support for basic writing skills. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, 15(2), 169–192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/105735699278251>
- Macarthur, C. A., Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (2004). *Insights from Instructional Research on Revision with Struggling Writers* (pp. 125–137). Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-1048-1_8
- McComiskey, B. (2000). Teaching Composition as a Social Process. *All USU Press Publications*. https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/usupress_pubs/127
- Mujtaba, S. M., Parkash, R., & Nawaz, M. W. (2020). Do Indirect Coded Corrective Feedback and Teachers Short Affective Comments Improve the Writing Performance and Learners Uptake? *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, 36(1), 34–47. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2019.1616638>
- Owocki, G. M., & Goodman, Y. M. (1997). The Teaching of Writing. In *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (pp. 77–85). Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-4540-4_9
- Paltridge, B. (2011). *Genre and English for Specific Purposes / Genre Across Borders (GXB)*. <https://genreacrossborders.org/research/genre-and-english-specific-purposes>
- Polio, C., & Shea, M. C. (2014). *An investigation into current measures of linguistic accuracy in second language writing research*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2014.09.003>
- Pollington, M. F., Wilcox, B., & Morrison, T. G. (2001). Self-perception in writing: The effects of writing workshop and traditional instruction on intermediate grade students. *Reading Psychology*, 22(4), 249–265. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02702710127640>
- Ray, K. (2001). *The writing workshop : working through the hard parts (and they're all hard parts)*. National Council of Teachers of English.
- Salem, A. A. M. S. (2013). The effect of writer's workshop approach to develop functional writing skills of primary stage pre-service English Language teachers in Egypt. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 2(5), 70–80. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.2n.5p.70>
- Schrodt, K. E., Elleman, A. M., FitzPatrick, E. R., Hasty, M. M., Kim, J. K., Tharp, T. J., & Rector, H. (2019). An Examination of Mindset Instruction, Self-Regulation, and Writer's Workshop on Kindergarteners' Writing Performance and Motivation: A Mixed-Methods Study. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, 35(5), 427–444. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2019.1577778>
- Serna, C. (2009). Autores Bilingues/Bilingual Authors: Writing within Dual Cultural and Linguistic Repertoires. *Undefined*.
- Smagorinsky, P., Johannessen, L., Kahn James, Elizabeth B., & Mccann, T. (2010). *Portsmouth, NH heinemann A Structured Process Approach for Middle and High School Instructor's Guide to*. www.coe.uga.edu/~smago/VirtualLibrary/Unit
- Smithson, M. S. (2008). *ACADEMIC EFFECTS OF WRITER'S WORKSHOP*.
- Suprianti, G. A. P. (2015). WRITING WORKSHOP AND JOURNAL WRITING TECHNIQUES; A COMPARATIVE STUDY IN TEACHING WRITING. In *Prasi: Jurnal Bahasa, Seni, dan Pengajarannya* (Vol. 10, Issue 20). <https://doi.org/10.23887/PRASI.V10I20.8913>
- Tangpermpoon, T. (2008). *Integrated Approaches to Improve Students Writing Skills*.

- Tortorelli, L. S. (2020). Beyond first grade: examining word, sentence, and discourse text factors associated with oral reading rate in informational text in second grade. *Reading and Writing*, 33(1), 143–170. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-019-09956-5>
- Vollmer, G. (2000). Praise and stigma: teachers’ constructions of the “typical esl student.” *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 21(1), 53–66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07256860050000795>
- Wolfe-Quintero, K. (1998). *Second language development in writing: measures of fluency, accuracy, & complexity*. Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center University of Hawaii at Manoa.
- Xu, Z., Banerjee, M., Ramirez, G., Zhu, G., & Wijekumar, K. (Kay). (2019). The effectiveness of educational technology applications on adult English language learners’ writing quality: a meta-analysis. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 32(1–2), 132–162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2018.1501069>